

# MUNGER AFRICANA



LIBRARY  
NOTES

5

Notes from the Munger Africana Library, issued occasionally, are eclectic within the field of Africana. They include unpublished historical documents, current field research reports, significant statistics gathered in the field, library-based analysis, and other material deemed useful to Africanists.

Most of the material will be generated from the library and from work in progress at the California Institute of Technology by faculty, distinguished visitors, and research assistants.

The Editorial Advisory Committee is drawn from Africanists at the Institute who have themselves published research on African topics. They include: Robert Bates (PhD MIT) Political Science; Margaret Rouse Bates (MA Harvard) Political Science; Kenneth Frederick (PhD MIT) Economics; Robert Huttenback (PhD UCLA) History; Edwin Munger (PhD Chicago) Political Geography, Editor; Robert Oliver (PhD Princeton) Economics. Thayer Scudder (PhD. Harvard) Anthropology  
Assistant Editors: Monique Le Blanc (MA UCLA) African Studies; Joanne Goldmann (BA CSCLA) English.  
Bibliographer: Edith Fisher (BA CSCLA)  
Business Manager: Kathie Marcum

Needless to say, viewpoints expressed in these occasional notes are solely the responsibility of the individual authors and may or may not have the concurrence of the editorial advisory committee. We seek exposure of facts and ideas, not the dissemination of dogma.

Correspondence should be addressed to:  
The Munger Africana Library  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California 91109

Subscriptions are \$10 a year. Prices of individual issues vary, but the total cost of all single issues during the year will be in excess of \$10.

© 1971 California Institute of Technology

## MUNGER AFRICANA LIBRARY NOTES

March 1971

One Dollar

#5

### CURRENT POLITICS IN GHANA

Dr. John Fynn, M.P.

#### Introduction

Dr. Fynn is an unusual man. He is an historian of 18th century Ashanti at the University of Ghana and is a Member of Parliament and Parliamentary Secretary for Local Administration. He went to Mfantisipim School which had been founded as an institution of higher learning at Cape Coast by the Methodist Church in 1876. It was the only secondary school in Ghana until Achimota was founded by the Gold Coast government in 1927. After Mfantisipim, Professor Fynn attended the University College of the Gold Coast. At Oxford he read the arts and majored in history, and later lived in London. He also spent two years working in the Copenhagen and Hague archives.

Dr. Fynn's remarks are followed by a series of questions and answers which are particularly interesting in the light they throw on the Nkrumah period and what has happened to some of those in power at that time.

Dr. Fynn spoke at a public seminar of the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences at the California Institute of Technology. The NOTE concludes with a comment on Dr. Fynn's remarks by an experienced and knowledgeable observer who is a resident in Ghana.

ESM

## Current Politics in Ghana

The British colony of the Gold Coast became the independent state of Ghana some 13 years ago and, being the first of its kind in the African context, the events brought inspiration and hope to all Africans, and to many of those beyond Africa. It was seen as a step in man's march toward the acceptance of racial equality and universal brotherhood. At that time, Ghanaians believed that independence would usher in not only freedom and justice -- which, incidentally, was boldly written on our coat of arms -- but also an era of plenty -- that is, plenty of food, plenty of good housing, and everything. Unfortunately, as you all know, we tragically failed in a great opportunity we had. The facts of inefficiency, the facts of bribery and corruption, the facts of capricious use of power and moral degeneration which characterized the Nkrumah regime are now common knowledge, and I do not think it is necessary for me to dilate on these. Because where I am concerned, their significance lies in the lessons they offer for the future.

On 1 October 1969 the soldiers and policemen of Ghana, who overthrew the Nkrumah regime, handed over power to the elected representatives of the people. This evolution from military to civilian rule was completed when, on 31 August 1970, Mr. Edward Akufo-Ado, the former Chief Justice, was elected the first president of the Second Republic of Ghana. This act of the members of the National Liberation Council was not only an example of dignity and nobility at its best, but also a demonstration to the world that in Ghana at least there are people who can rise to heights of grandeur. But in spite of the fact that the National Liberation Council has given Ghanaians a second chance to live on their representative institutions and the rule of law, the new civilian administration headed by Kofi Busia is left with very little to give to the farmers, to the fishermen, and to the working people of Ghana. I need not tell you that at the time of the overthrow of the Nkrumah government, Ghana was in debt to a total of about a billion dollars -- an Nkrumah legacy of debts and half-completed and uneconomical projects. It takes about 13% of Ghana's limited earnings from cocoa and other exports to service a debt of over a billion dollars. Unemployment still stands at about 25%, and the population is rising faster than national income.

This is clearly a poor outlook for democracy, but we have opted for democracy because we think that it is the best hope of mankind. It is our belief that Ghanaians have the talent, ability, and resources to build a democratic, happy, prosperous, and progressive country in which everybody will live in dignity and freedom. The carefully thought-out program of the Busia administration is hindered by having to overcome the



heritage of indebtedness, squalor, hunger, and disease. It is our determination to save the country from bankruptcy and economic ruin and to lay a firm foundation for sustained economic growth.

In the new Ghana, emphasis is being put on the human being and his condition. The Busia administration believes that attention should be focused all the time on the individual citizen and on the quality of life that he is enabled to live. This is a fundamental basis of the domestic as well as the foreign policy of the present government of Ghana. In Ghana it is plain insistence on the need to see the country clean of bribery and corruption, nepotism, inefficiency, and moral turpitude. We are insisting on the personal integrity and quality of one's life because we hold that there is a moral language of courtesy, of kindness, and of consideration that all humanity understands, whatever may be the differences in rank, language, or culture.

Secondly, it explains the emphasis we are placing on rural development -- that is, that the present government has emphasized. All the regions in Ghana are crying for basic amenities, such as good drinking water, electricity, comfortable and decent houses, hospitals, health centers, sanitary facilities and roads. To provide these for the majority of our people who live in the rural areas, the government has taken certain concrete steps. A National Service Corps has been established to bring together and to organize purposefully all who desire to do something to help the nation to provide our various communities with some of the many essential services and amenities we lack. The National Service Corps will only undertake such projects as farming, building roads, outposts, markets, latrines, low cost houses, schools, community centers and generally spreading amenities to town and village communities. Let me point out that the National Service Corps is intended to start as a voluntary service, though it will also provide opportunities for paid employment as well as training which will ensure paid employment or improve one's chances of earning more.

Thirdly, a bill will be introduced which will give the opportunity to local communities to participate fully in deciding what they want. This is being done because we believe that personal liberty, freedom of thought and action, and freedom of speech can only be safeguarded in representative institutions, in the power of the body of citizens to express their will through their government and the use they make of that power. In short, we hold that we cannot achieve much unless the effort of the central government is complemented by an efficient local government system.

Fourthly, in Parliament we have passed an act known as the

"Ghanaian Business Promotion Act." This act is intended to keep certain Ghanaian businesses, such as bakeries, taxi service, etc., in Ghanaian hands. For instance, the Lebanese or Syrians are regularly in control of city transportation in Ghana. Well, we want this to be in Ghanaian hands. We also intend to put in Ghanaian hands such businesses as the bakeries, and petty trading. The result has been that we have given the people involved the opportunity to leave the country as soon as possible.

In terms of education, as I pointed out, we have been producing large numbers of unemployable scholars. The University of Ghana, which is established on the lines of a British University, tended to produce physicists, chemists, biologists, historians, English scholars, etc. In the context of a developing country, you need engineers and technologists. Therefore, it is the aim of the present government in terms of education to reorganize the content of education so these people could take their rightful place as effective members of a modern productive society.

Finally, we are emphasizing the need to study and to understand our culture. We believe a people's culture consists of a way of living; it includes the distinctive masses of people, and it means more than just the beautiful Ghanaian kente cloth. The Progress Party Government believes that the people should understand the accumulated experience and wisdom of their forefathers. In other words, we need to appreciate our heritage: art, song, dance, language, religion, family relationships, and reciprocal obligations and responsibilities. They must appreciate the moral and social values which have guided the conduct and sustained our communities. We appreciate the point that as Africans we have a distinctive contribution to make in terms of culture and this, which is expressed in our songs and in our dance, should be highlighted.

The present government also recognizes that the task of completely integrating different tribes into a modern nation within a democratic framework has still to be attained. This task in the Ghanaian context is hindered by the narrow but strong bonds of tribalism. This tribalism stems basically from a fear and distrust that certain local communities have not had and will not have their fair share of development and of the nation's wealth. The present government is determined to see that there is a more equitable distribution of what our nation can offer. We are not going to refuse to put a road in this constituency because the member of that constituency is in the opposition. We are going to take a total view of the country's development as a whole. I would like to remind you that we in Ghana believe that success in nation building will depend on the active participation of all Ghanaians, irrespective of their tribal or political affiliations. And our assumption is based on the point that we share a common

future and perhaps a common danger and a common destiny. This roughly is the domestic policy of Ghana. This is what we will be trying to pursue in the next five years, until we could be voted out.

Our domestic policy also has relevance to our foreign policy. Our foreign policy has been described by the Prime Minister as one of non-alignment. But this has meaning only in the total context of our contemporary world where two power blocs -- that is, the western or the free world, if I may use that word, led by the United States, and the Warsaw Pact countries led by the Soviet Union -- are championing two conflicting ideologies. We do not intend to belong to either bloc. However, non-alignment at the moment to the present government and to the people of Ghana does not mean non-involvement. Our interpretation of the doctrine is that we reserve the right to use our own judgment and to make our own decisions on international issues on the basis of two considerations: first, that of the interests of Ghana within the context of our international obligations; and second, that of the welfare and peace of the world on which our progress and prosperity are ultimately to depend. We believe that in the world context Ghana can only progress. We can only fulfill what we have set out to do if there is peace in the world. And in that sense we are prepared to pursue it in concert with other nations, and, especially, through the United Nations and the Organization of Africa Unity.

Whereas we shall not be tied to the apronstrings of any country, whether it be east or west, realism compels us to recognize certain facts of history. Historical contacts and experiences have made it necessary for us to share more common interests with some countries at this point of time than with others. They compel us to endeavor to forge the closest links with our brothers in Africa, particularly with our neighbors with whom we share common boundaries. We are also made to recognize that we need to establish relations with all countries in the pursuit of world peace and brotherhood. There can be no inequality in our common humanity. Indeed, fundamental to our foreign policy is a firm conviction that international relations must be based on the acceptance of two established facts: that all races are equally human, and that human cultures do not and cannot divide men. Because we believe that all men are capable of learning and mastering any culture to which they are given sufficient exposure and opportunity to learn. In other words, the cultural achievements of all men of all ages, all countries, constitute the common heritage of man from which all can and may draw. Looking at things in this way, philosophies that are based on maintaining divisions among peoples are not acceptable to us. We consider policies based on racial or cultural discrimination or subjugation to be wrong in their philosophic assumptions as well as being threats to world peace. Therefore, we in Ghana view the policies

of South Africa, Rhodesia, and Portugal in this light. We think that the philosophies of these minority governments are based on false and pernicious doctrines, which are morally and intellectually indefensible.

### Questions and Answers

Q: Ghana has come in for a lot of criticism in the world community recently because of its policy of offering people who are not citizens of Ghana the opportunity of leaving. Do you defend this on the grounds that if there is a Ghanaian and a non-Ghanaian to fill one job, you would prefer the Ghanaian, since there is a 25% unemployment rate?

A: The tendency in Ghana now is to turn inward, to get things done, rather than shout about ideals which are totally irrelevant to rapid development of any of the African states. We are in a mess at the moment as a result of the bad policies pursued by the Nkrumah government. The country is on the brink of bankruptcy. This has been corrected by the soldiers and policemen who took over, and we are continuing. But we are not out of the woods yet. The whole question of this alien policy is bound up with our economic policy. We realize that many of the people who were in prison, living on free government food, were foreigners. You may say that this is a very frivolous point, but this is relevant. I mean, if you are going to have prisoners who are non-Ghanaians and who have nothing to contribute except crime, I think the sooner we get rid of them, the better. The point is that there are a lot of foreigners in Ghana who do not see the interests of Ghana as their own. We have a number of Syrians and Lebanese and Nigerians and other people who think that they can smuggle diamonds out of the country at will. If you know any of the West African countries, the people there can just move forwards and backwards. Many of the people from the liberated territories have no traveling documents. And I don't think that anyone who would want to run the country properly would allow this sort of thing to go on. Apart from this, we also realized all of a sudden that many Ghanaian businesses are in foreign hands. This was not due to the fact that Ghanaians are lazy or anything of the sort. It was part of the British colonial policy, people tended to trust, or rather the bankers were prepared to give money to, Syrians and Lebanese and other people because they are foreigners and they can easily be got at, rather than give it to the Ghanaians to promote their businesses.

Toward the end of the 19th century -- the 1850's onwards -- Ghanaians were in control of petty trade and other small businesses. By



the middle of the 20th century, Ghanaians are not in that type of business. So when you take the big businesses in foreign hands -- firms like United Africa Company, the French firm of C. F. A. O. and others -- you also find that in the middle you have Syrians and Lebanese occupying these areas. And the Ghanaians, apart from selling their cocoa, have nothing. As I said, all of this is intended to raise the living standards and the economic standard of the Ghanaian. And in doing that I think we owe apologies to nobody.

Q. Does this policy prohibit foreign capital from coming in?

A: No, no, not at all. In fact even the aliens, if you are prepared to satisfy us that you are a Ghanaian businessman -- in other words, if you are able to comply with our laws -- you are perfectly welcome. In a way, it was intended to get rid of the phoney businessman. Anybody who comes in with good intentions, bringing money to help the country, he is welcome. But a kind of businessman who will come and actually dupe the country, this is the kind of man we don't want. Syrians and Lebanese there who are doing genuine business are all right, if they are not operating in those reserved for Ghanaians. I will give you an instance of their duplicity. We suddenly told them that if you had not been showing income tax returns based on annual earnings of \$500,000, you must leave. These people were grossing more than \$1 million a year, but they didn't want to pay income taxes, so they were declaring \$20,000 or \$15,000 profits. Many of them came with all sorts of excuses: "Oh, we were going to declare this other money, but we didn't know. . ." They failed to declare proper income tax returns, and now they are out.

Q: In trying to get development capital into Ghana and at the same time remaining non-aligned, are you running into troubles?

A: I think both power blocs are now coming to appreciate that it doesn't pay to make aid they have given a condition for their support. If America, for instance, has given us money and is undertaking a policy which we think is morally wrong, we cannot support it.

Q: What sort of steps is Ghana taking for the liberation of Southern Africa?

A: Ghana, under the Nkrumah regime, was shouting all over the place about the need to liberate South Africa and Rhodesia, and all these areas. Now we believe that the point is not to shout, but to work in concert with other African countries to free these areas. The burden of freeing these areas should not be Ghana's alone. In fact, this con-

tributed in a way to the depleted economy of the country. If the Africans are sincere about all they are going to do, then we must all put our cards on the table, and solve this problem. We intend to help in freeing South Africa through the Organization of African Unity. Also, Ghana has been contributing its quota as far as the financing of the liberation fighters.

Q: Is it true that when President Banda went to Malawi from Ghana to launch his campaign to gain independence, he was given by Nkrumah over \$200,000 cash from the Ghanaian treasury?

A: And we also give Guinea \$10 million. And we gave \$5 million to Mali. When I say that these contributed in a way to depleting our economy, that is what I mean. Guinea hasn't repaid a penny. Mali has decided to pay. But this kind of giving cannot be done now. You see, you cannot behave like this when 8 miles outside the kraal there is poverty staring you in the face. When you have bad drinking water just outside the kraal, this doesn't mean anything. And this is why I would like to emphasize that the Ghanaian coup, contrary to some stupid assertions being put around in the United States and other places, was conceived and executed by Ghanaian soldiers themselves. They needed no prompting from anybody. If my mother in the village is drinking dirty water and there are diseases all over the place, and I am a soldier in the position to get rid of them, then I will do just that. And this is precisely what happened.

As far as the African Unity business is concerned, I think it is about time we become realists about this matter. People think, and this is especially true among the blacks in America, that Nkrumah was better because he was talking about African unity. Well, it is no good being on friendly terms with Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Togo, Dahomey, and Nigeria, and hope that you are going to achieve African unity. And this was precisely Ghana's position for fifteen years. We dismantled the West African Airways. We dismantled the Western Cocoa Research Institutes. We dismantled the West Africa Examination Council -- all those sorts of things which were established by the Colonial government. And these were things in fact which united the whole of British West Africa. What was needed was just paving the way for French West Africa to come in.

Ever since Nkrumah was overthrown the NLC was able to pave the way for good relationships with our neighbors. The Prime Minister has paid state visits to the Ivory Coast and Togo. We are on very friendly terms with Mali and Upper Volta. We are thinking seriously of having something like an economic union of West Africa. We think

this is a more rational way of setting about African unity than just talking about it and doing the opposite thing.

We have come in for some bad criticism from Nigeria simply because they had about 1 million people in Ghana smuggling diamonds and doing all sorts of things. If you want Ghana to survive, you cannot in the interest of African unity allow this sort of thing to go on. And I have been telling the black Americans that when they expect us to sympathize with them, to look at their problems and their humiliations and their sufferings, we expect them to understand us and what went on in the Nkrumah regime. I cannot forgive anybody who knocks at my door in the middle of the night and takes away my father and imprisons him for five years without trial because he has spoken against the government. But this is what was happening and it was the whole purpose of the Preventive Detention Act.

Q: How do you feel about Ghana's supplying funds to overthrow governments of other African states which do not subscribe to the principals of democracy which you enunciate?

A: This I must tell you bluntly is a thing of the past. It died with the Nkrumah regime. We will never subvert any African government.

Q: Does this include governments with which you would politically disagree?

A: Oh, yes. That is their own business. We may have misgivings about how somebody is running their internal affairs, but if that is what the people of that particular state want, let them go ahead. This is acting on the assumption, of course, that when they see what the whole thing is about, they will probably stop being that way. We believe in strict noninterference in anybody's internal affairs.

When we took over the government, there were people in Ghana from Upper Volta, from Mali, and from other states who were plotting overthrows. Some were from Niger. In a small town near Colombo -- a gold mining town in the bush -- they were training people in guerilla warfare to go and overthrow an African government. This is something that our present government and the present Ghanaian people will not accept. The majority of the people were horrified, because many of us did not even know that this kind of activity was going on in the country.

Q: Is the attempt to establish a large pool of people who are trained in building houses, roads, and this type of thing actually under way now, and, if so, how is it funded?

A: We will need American money if we can get it. At the moment Parliament has given \$1 million to start this. But the interesting thing is that people in rural areas and other places are getting involved in this whole business. I went with the Prime Minister to a small place -- in fact, the hometown of General Ocran -- and the National Service Corps is building a new health center there. It is fascinating to see how everyone is so enthusiastic and trying to help. You will get people with expert knowledge in bricklaying and engineering and that kind of thing. But the actual collection of water to mix the cement -- that is being done by the people themselves. It is part of the Ghanaian tradition that when somebody is doing something nice for you which is benefitting you, you try to be very grateful and being grateful in our context means giving the workers free food and that kind of thing. This is being done very well by the villagers because they appreciate what is being done for them. But because of our very bad economic position, we want to maintain its voluntary character. If we have the money we will go ahead and build health centers for everybody.

Q: Is the military under certain pressures to leave the civilian government alone?

A: Well, everybody knows that in Latin America and in parts of Africa you have leaders of the coups turning themselves into Presidents. So, we had to watch and see. And in fact they acted true to their way. The army men immediately appointed a constitutional commission headed by the chief justice. They drew up a new constitution because they suspended the old constitution which made Nkrumah President for life. A constitutional assembly also went in to do its work. And they approved the final constitution.

Q: Do you believe this is unique?

A: It is a unique behavior. And I think this partly stems from the Ghanaian character. If Nkrumah had done what the Ghanaians had wanted, he would still be in. He had every opportunity to be a great man -- there is no doubt about that. But I think he wanted to use Ghanaians as cannon fodder to achieve his own personal ambition in Africa. And this means denying people the basic amenities of good drink, work, and other things.

Q: Nkrumah started as relatively unselfish in his ambitions for Ghana and for Africa. What do you think tipped him into becoming a megalomaniac, as well as being paranoid? Do you think that he always had this idea that Ghanaians were going to be cannon fodder for his ideas of being President of Africa, or was there a character change?

A: I think that when anybody starts off by thinking that your fellow human beings are fools and that you alone can bring sanity into the world, you are not very far from getting into the position he did. I think this is basically what Nkrumah did. He was a very charming man and everybody believed in him. In fact, from 1948 up to about 1956, to many he was the savior. At that time he had no power -- the British were still there. He had this saying which I think is really pregnant with meaning, he twisted a biblical saying: "Seek ye first the political kingdom, and everything will be added unto that." When they are selling power, you go and buy it. You sell your mother to go and buy power. Because when you have got the power, you can free your mother. And this is what I think he was doing. Apart from this, I think he had genuine reasons to be a Lenin or a Churchill or a Kennedy for Africa. He wanted to go down in history as a great man. He sincerely thought that Ghana was too small for his personal ambition.

Q: Did he think this all the way along, or did this come at a certain stage in his career?

A: Well, I don't think he had a break in this kind of reasoning. I think if you followed closely his activities in the United States and in London, you'll see the whole thing running through. You know he was a very good friend of Azikwe in Nigeria. But he was not prepared to accept leadership from anybody. People like Gbedemah and Botsio were his equals to begin with, and Gbedemah did the organizing.

Q: Didn't Gbedemah get him into power when Nkrumah was in jail and Gbedemah won the elections?

A: That's right. Later on, Nkrumah felt that these people were pestering him and they would have to go, and so he destroyed them. Botsio decided to conform and, as it were, to resign himself. Gbedemah couldn't stand it. He braved it, and then walked out, and became Nkrumah's bitterest enemy. Nkrumah wanted to put him into detention, but never caught him. Robert Gardiner left the country. Everybody who mattered in the public service left the country.

Q: What has happened to Botsio? Was he run out of the country?

A: Not at all. It is not like reading Nkrumah's "Dark Days in Ghana," where everybody is shot in the streets. It's incredible. I have never seen a happier time in Ghana than the day that Nkrumah was overthrown. In fact, his ministers denounced him immediately. And the soldiers -- I don't know how they behaved like that, but they rather tended to protect the ministers, because they were going to be lynched -- many of them were going to be lynched. And the soldiers quickly rounded them up and put them in jail, in the fort, to prevent them from being lynched. All of these ministers are doing business in Ghana now. Those who had salted away money are sitting in Europe and other places squandering the money -- the Ghanaian taxpayer's money. Krobo Edusei is still in Ghana. He can't get out. He wanted to go to Switzerland to chop his money, but he can't get out. But he still has sufficient to go around. You know he acquired twenty-four houses between '50 and '56.

Q: The Edusei who attracted some attention because his wife went to an auction in London and paid \$10,000 to buy a golden bed and caused a certain amount of notoriety?

A: Yes. Just as if I walked into a Los Angeles shop and saw a golden bed, and the shopkeeper looks me up and down and says, "All right, \$8,000." Then the fellow signs a check and goes straightaway into the bank and the money is there, in London.

Q: Wasn't that doing pretty well for someone who was a fireman on the railways?

A: Yes. And this was at a time when people had to queue up for milk, or for a tin of milk.

Q: Does he move around Ghana freely now?

A: Oh, yes, he comes into my office whistling. He is very happy. Everybody likes him. You know, he is such a character. I remember when we were reading the last budget, he was up there in the gallery. I went to his house the other day and he's living beautifully. He was like Nkrumah in my house, like family. This was true even though we owned "The Pioneer," the paper which consistently opposed Nkrumah. We still have it.

But to come back to the point, this is the kind of propaganda which is going on. You have the "African World" being financed by the Communists, Nkrumah, and some in East Africa and being published in London which gives a distorted picture of Ghana. But we are not very



much worried about that. Some people say that we should also mount a propaganda campaign in the western capitals. We feel that is not necessary. What we think is necessary is to give our people who matter to us water, and latrines, and health centers.

Q: Was Mrs. DuBois thrown out of Ghana?

A: She wasn't. What happened is that the soldiers immediately after the coup felt that some foreigners -- South African whites, British non-conformists, British bedfellows and fellow travelers, like Geoffrey Bing and others, some Americans -- these people, who were pumping ideas and doing all sorts of things to Nkrumah, should have to leave. So after the coup the soldiers were after these people, not to kill them, but just to get rid of them out of the country. Mrs. DuBois was not one of those people.

Many Ghanaians feel that Nkrumah tended to degenerate more after the death of George Padmore. At the time of Padmore, his African policies were good. After that they degenerated. Nkrumah had nobody. He had a lot to do, overseeing so many things, and he didn't get anybody like Padmore. So you had a man who was basically an academic and also a public servant. The Ghanaian public's civil servant brought up as he is, and as he was, in the best tradition of British public service, is just to take his orders and rarely the initiative. This is very bad, of course. The British public service succeeds that way because in the first instance you have a Permanent Secretary who himself is very knowledgeable and who is almost the equal of the British politician -- I mean the old school boys, the Oxford and Cambridge type men. I saw this myself in England. When you bring this down to the colonies, it doesn't usually work very well because you have a very brilliant chap being a principal secretary and a fool in politics. Nkrumah's immense power meant a civil servant couldn't offer any opposition. And, therefore, what passed as an African policy was really no African policy at all.

Q: Would you comment on the election?

A: At the time of the election, I think American and other western commentators thought that Gbedemah was going to win. I think there was faulty reasoning somewhere because people thought that because Gbedemah was able to organize for Nkrumah to get in in 1950, he would also do it in 1969. I think there was faulty reasoning here because people did not also take into account the fact that for thirteen years Gbedemah was Nkrumah's Finance Minister. Therefore, people are not likely to dis-

associate him from the fact that the country is now broke. And this is precisely what happened. In other words, whereas anybody in Busia's campaign had a lot to say about Gbedemah, there was little to criticize Busia for. Because Busia had challenged Nkrumah to the point where he could not win and he left for exile in Europe. We knew that we were going to win. But I thought we were going to get about 110 seats. I was not entirely right and it was partly due to the Volta region. I thought we were going to get about six or seven seats there, but, unfortunately, we got only two seats. That is Gbedemah's area. I don't know what happened; they probably used some tribalism there.

Q: Don't you think it might be dangerous to a continuance of democratic rule in Ghana if your party got very much stronger?

A: It is illegal in Ghana for the state to become a one-party state.

Q: But what happens if one party wins every seat honestly?

A: I think that we are lucky now that we have somebody like Busia. He not only believes in the democratic idea, but also wants to practice it. Fortunately, he has collected around him people who also believe in this kind of thing. I don't foresee that this will veer towards one-party dictatorship in Ghana in the near future. But neither do I rule the possibility out. In my region, which is in the center around Cape Coast, all you have to do is tell people, "Look, in 15 years, what Nkrumah did for us and Gbedemah was with him. No good water, no lights. . . ." "Oh, yes, you are right -- you are the man we want." It is as simple as that.

Q: But after five years, isn't someone going to ask what you have done?

A: This is the challenge. We are in the unfortunate situation of not having the kind of money which Nkrumah had to start with. If you Americans believe in democracy, we need your help to get things done in Ghana.

Q: Can the new democratic regime get more help from the United States than Nkrumah did?

A: We do not know yet, and we are not actually depending on any particular group for money. We are prepared to present a program to everyone -- individual foreigners, or groups, or nations -- and if

they are willing to help, come ahead. If we get some help from African countries -- rich African countries, like Ivory Coast just next door -- we will be glad to have it. We are not particularly interested whether or not the United States will come in to help to make our democracy work. Democracy can only work when the people themselves have that attitude of mind. If people are so subservient in their wealth and thinking, if they are so docile, and if they want always to be led by a demagogue, a country can easily succumb to a dictatorship. But when you have a group of people in a country who want to be informed of what is happening, who want to see what they want to see, as you have in Ghana now, I think democracy will work in spite of anybody being willing to give us money or not. We have put our cards on the table to the people. We have told them the condition of the country, what we intend doing for them, and we have actually shown what we can do by starting off. We have also been working very closely with the World Bank and the International Monetary, and the United States helps with them.

Q: But aren't you in a climate of a decline in American interest in foreign aid as opposed to domestic problems, and a decline in American and Soviet willingness to compete in a cold war? It is not your fault. But in terms of American aid, isn't it difficult?

A: Yes. You see, Ghana, although it is not now economically in very good shape, is one of the potentially rich countries in West Africa. We have just discovered oil off shore. We don't know how much this is going to influence our economy, but we hope that it will. We still continue to produce half the world's cocoa, which you eat as chocolates. We have diamonds, which many aliens are smuggling out. We have manganese and we have large sources of untapped bauxite, which we are going to exploit. And, thanks to American help, we have the power to smelt this. We have the Akusumbo Dam. Potentially, we are a very rich country. Our leadership has got us the priorities rights.

Q: How much of a block is tribalism in unifying your country? Do you have any laws now against people preaching tribalism?

A: Oh, yes. To start with, it was made impossible for anybody to form a political party on tribal lines or religious lines. You know, Nkrumah, in order to get rid of him to start with in the early '50's, there were religious parties like the Moslem Association Party and then the Ashanti-based National Liberation Movement. Now it is impossible to form a party of that kind. It is against the fundamental law of the land, that is, the constitution. If you want to form a political party in Ghana, you have to get 54 founding members drawn from the 9

regions, 6 from each region. After the election, people thought the country was divided on tribal lines because the Volta region from where comes Gbedemah voted for his party. We won two seats there. Then we won all the seats in my region. We won all the seats because I am a very good campaigner, you know. We won all the seats in Ashanti. Some commentators write nonsense, because the kind of tribalism which people find some places in Africa does not exist in Ghana. I mean, you can go to Accra and meet any woman and marry her if you want to. And there will be no inhibition at all.

Q: Has the situation in the secondary and primary schools Nkrumah set up been changed?

A: No. Nkrumah didn't set up bad secondary schools. People needed education and this was a very good point; he thought it was a very good idea. He thought that education must be spread widely and, therefore, he built a number of secondary schools. What we are now seeing is what kind of benefit the country is going to get from the products of these secondary schools. Because it is no good being a good physicist, a good chemist, and not getting a job.

Q: But one of the criticisms in writings about Ghana was that these schools were set up and then there was no provision made for decent teachers for them.

A: Yes, quite. You establish schools all over the place and then you don't get teachers to go to them and teach in them. But that is not important. What is important is the quality of the student, of the product, of the man who comes out. In fact, we think we are having a glut of school teachers now, for the same reason we are closing a number of our teacher training colleges. We are telling them to go to the secondary schools rather than to the teacher training colleges.

Q: Do you think there was a misallocation of money for education as opposed to providing industry and the jobs to utilize it?

A: Yes, this is a criticism which could apply to all the African countries. But I think in the African countries it is not a valid criticism. I think what the leaders feel, and what everybody in our position will feel, is that we must try as much as possible to minimize illiteracy. What I think has to be done is to ensure that the kind of products turned out from our schools are productive in our social context, that they are relevant to our developing situation. I don't think it is basically a bad idea to get as many educated people as possible. We think that now the private individuals

should also bear some part of the responsibility such as childrens' fees. We haven't come to that yet, but I think this is the thought going on now. This is what was happening in Ghana in the 18th and 19th centuries. People were educated in Cambridge and Oxford by their parents, and I don't see why it shouldn't be done again.

Q: Are there a significant number of people who can contribute towards the education of their children?

A: Yes, there are quite a number of people who can pay for their children's education. In fact, you have the Ghanaian families whose children are still being educated in England, and even in the secondary schools and public schools. My own cousin is at Bath -- Kingswood.

Comment by an Informed Observer  
of the Ghanaian Scene

Dr. Fynn asserts that "The carefully thought-out program of the Busia administration is hindered by the heritage of indebtedness, squalor, hunger and disease." This is a theme that has been constantly about since the coup and is likely to be the major rationale that the Progress Party offers to the voters in three years' time to explain the lack of progress. I think it is wearing thin after more than three years of military government and two years of civilian government dedicated to the reversal of the policies of the past.

It is quite significant that Dr. Fynn's listing of the objectives of the present government makes no mention of efforts to stimulate agriculture or other economic sectors. There is only the reference to the Business Promotion Act, which is not designed to stimulate business but rather to give Ghanaians an increasing share of the control of existing businesses. I am afraid this is an accurate expression of Busia's view of the role of government: looking after the welfare of the people by building up health services, schools, electricity, water supply, without due regard to the policies which will stimulate the economy sufficiently to be able to afford all this. On the other hand one welcomes the stated (although as yet very incompletely implemented) policy of retreat from direct public participation in economic activities. The combination of monetary and fiscal policies (overvalued exchange rates, import controls, low interest rates, guaranteed minimum wages) are still largely in effect and still giving the wrong signals to the economy, which is responding in a predictable fashion. The social sector programmes described by Dr.

Fynn will have to be largely internally financed from very limited resources. Even if the government succeeds in squeezing out enough money to get them built, the new facilities will simply join the ranks of those starved of recurrent funds and adequately trained personnel.

One would hope that an increasing number of the social sector projects, such as rural water supply, health centers, and educational facilities, would be tied in with regional projects with some income-producing activity at the center, such as an agricultural credit scheme for the increasing of maize yield or livestock production.

The National Service Corps is an example of the tendency of the government to give expression to a new policy by creating a new organization rather than reforming or reorganizing or even working through an existing agency. Inter-agency coordination becomes increasingly complex and often ends up having to be done at cabinet level.

While the government is spending N¢ 1 million on the National Service Corps, upon which great emphasis has been placed, it is at the same time continuing to spend about N¢ 4,000,000 annually on the Workers Brigade (net subsidy). With this amount the Brigaders are able to produce about N¢ 500,000 worth of goods and services. The government has given the Brigade no clear role to play other than to remove the paramilitary aspects of the programme and to remove it from the Ministry of Defense. Yet it continues to support it, but at a level which ensures it will do little more than provide salaries for approximately 12,000 people. I fear the Service Corps will suffer a similar fate.

Unless the government terminates numerous non-productive projects and programmes, most of which originated during the Nkrumah years, there will be insufficient resources -- both money and skilled manpower -- to make much progress in implementing the policies of the present government. The proliferation of projects, programmes, and agencies will also frustrate the government's desire to control bribery, corruption, nepotism, and inefficiency. Proliferation of agencies at the national level will also frustrate the desire to strengthen regional and local governments.

There is something of a contradiction in Dr. Fynn's view of education. First he says education must be tailored to the needs of the economy, and supply should not exceed demand. Then he says, "I don't think it is basically a bad idea to get as many educated people as possible." This is a good illustration of the government's ambivalence on this question. Dr. Fynn's comments also illustrate the contradiction between what



he feels, as a public official, is good for the country (educational systems should produce people trained in skills that can be absorbed by the economy) and what he considers, as a member of the elite society, as being more prestigious (a classical English education). The Ghanaian educational system is consumption, rather than production, oriented. It is designed, especially at the higher levels, to produce people with a European standard of living, but without the necessary managerial and technical skills or the supporting cast of middle-level technical and managerial personnel to provide the economic growth to support this standard of living.

Dr. Fynn shares two objectives that are common to many African countries: preserve the culture and stamp out tribalism which is the basis of the culture. However, Ghana seems to have been more successful at both than most African countries. The fact that the country has been controlled for some time by a detribalized, Westernized elite which patronizes traditional cultural happenings (personified by Busia) may be the answer.

So far it is true, particularly of the agricultural sector, that non-Progress Party areas have not been discriminated against. This was not true of the old regime.

Dr. Fynn indicates correctly that there will be a decidedly less active foreign policy than was the case under Nkrumah. Foreign policy is likely to increasingly center around debt, liquidity, and foreign exchange problems, the dialogue with South Africa issue notwithstanding. Ghana will need to be bailed out several more times in the next few years, at least until the oil starts flowing. Foreign policy will relate to the response of the creditor and donor countries and Ghana's response to the conditions that that group is likely to place on giving more support. The donors' club is likely to increasingly insist on a number of reforms and changes in economic policies as a condition for more support, since otherwise there is a growing belief that the money will just follow previous support down the rat hole. If Ghana refuses to comply, there could be some interesting developments on the foreign policy front as Ghana looks elsewhere. In the fact of a very serious foreign exchange crisis and shortage of government revenues, all sorts of wild things might happen. It is doubtful it will come to that, however, since the donors can offer short-run relief out of petty cash. There are hopes that the government will respond positively when the squeeze comes and the basis will then be set for rapid growth in the late 1970's fed by the oil.

It is amazing that the Alien Compliance Order was accom-

plished as peacefully as it was despite the short notice and the administrative quagmire it created. It is also significant that it does not seem to have seriously damaged relations with neighboring African states. As an aside, it was commonly stated in Ghana at the time that 80%-plus of the criminals in Ghana were aliens, and there was real surprise among Ghanaians that crime continued after the expulsion of the aliens. At least crime had been Ghanaianized in the spirit of the Business Promotion Act!

The fact that many of the old Nkrumah people, such as Edusei, are still about, and in many cases active in the economy, despite their activities under the old regime being publically condemned, is, on the whole, a good sign. To jail, ban, or otherwise immobilize them all would be to throw away a large chunk of Ghana's pool of skilled manpower. Many are quite active in private business at the present time.